

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the interview conducted on August 12, 2004.

The Office Action dated March 22, 2004 has been reviewed and the Examiner's comments carefully considered.

By way of this Amendment and Reply, claims 27-30 have been canceled; claims 21, 26, and 59 have been amended; and claims 64-70 have been added.

Claims 21-26 and 59-70 are pending in the application.

Claims 21-24, 26-30 and 59-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Newhouse et al. (USP 5,997,080). Claims 21-22, 25-26, 28-29, 59-60 and 63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Shafer et al. (USP 5,358,307). Applicants traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Claim 21 defines a child seat that includes an "object holder [that] includes a cavity for receiving objects . . . wherein the cavity is partially under the seating surface in the retracted, storage position." Neither Newhouse et al. nor Shafer et al. teach or suggest such an object holder. For at least this reason, applicants traverse the rejections of claim 21 and its dependent claims 22-26 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b).

Claim 59 defines a child seat that includes an "object holder having a cavity for receiving objects; wherein when the object holder is in the retracted, storage position, a first portion of the cavity extends beyond an outer side surface of the base, and a second portion of the cavity does not extend beyond the outer side surface of the base." Neither Newhouse et al. nor Shafer et al. teach or suggest such an object holder. For at least this reason, applicants traverse the rejections of claim 59 and its dependent claims 60-63 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b).

Claims 27-30 have been canceled. Thus, as to those claims, the rejections are moot.

Applicants have added new claims 64-70 to the application. Claim 64 defines a child seat that includes an “object holder having a cavity for receiving objects; wherein the object holder only partially retracts within the base in the retracted, storage position such that a first portion of the cavity remains extended from the base and a second portion of the cavity retracts within the base.” Neither Newhouse et al. nor Shafer et al. teach or suggest such an object holder. For at least this reason, applicants submit that claim 64 and its dependent claims 65-70 are patentable over these references.

In reviewing the application file, the undersigned has noted that applicants’ PTO/SB/08 Form submitted with their Information Disclosure Statement on October 24, 2003 has not been acknowledged by the Examiner. The Examiner, therefore, is requested to return the initialed form to the undersigned.

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 CFR 1.16 - 1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 CFR 1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date August 20, 2004

By Mary Michelle Kile

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5428
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

Mary Michelle Kile
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 35,217